



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,771	09/17/2003	Achim Kraiss	13906-109001 / 2003P00171	4871

32864 7590 04/04/2007
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

SAINT CYR, LEONARD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/664,771	Applicant(s) KRAISS ET AL.	
	Examiner Leonard Saint-Cyr	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 10, line 1, "the computer-implemented method" should be replaced by – a computer-implemented method - . Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1- 4, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lakritz (WO 01/69420).

As per claim 1, Lakritz teaches a computer-implemented method for providing multi-language support for data mining models, the method comprising:

receiving an extension document (website visitor suggests receiving an input information) having first and second entries associated with a unique identifier ("tag-based templates allow a single document to be used across all languages") in a textual description field of a data mining model ("template model"), the first entry including textual information in a first language, and the second entry including textual information in a second language ("a single document can be constructed so that it will

Art Unit: 2626

automatically localized for different languages and locales”; page 10, lines 4 – 6, and 31 – 37; page 44, lines 4 – 30; page 45, lines 15, and 16) ;

processing a request from a front-end application to execute an analytical task associated with the data mining model (“automatically determines the language and country of the web site visitor and directs the web server to deliver the appropriate localized content”; Abstract, lines 1 - 3; page 3, lines 5 – 10) and

outputting to the front-end application an updated model output that includes the first entry such that the textual information is output in the first language (“ the requested document is automatically served in the visitor’s language”; Abstract, lines 6 – 8; page 44, lines 25, and 26).

As per claim 10, Lakritz teaches a computer-implemented method for outputting textual descriptions of data fields in a data mining model in a selected language, the method comprising:

receiving an extension document corresponding to a data mining model, the model including a unique identifier associated with a textual description of a data field in the data mining model; storing contents of the extension document in a database (“content from the database”), the contents of the extension document having first and second entries associated with the unique identifier (“tag-based templates allow a single document to be used across all languages”), the first entry including the textual description of the data field in a first language, and the second entry including the textual description of the data field in a second language (“a single document can be

Art Unit: 2626

constructed so that it will automatically localized for different languages and locales"; page 10, lines 4 – 6, and 31 – 37; page 44, lines 4 – 30; page 45, lines 15, and 16; content from the database"; Abstract, lines 7, and 8); and

outputting to a front-end application an updated model output that includes the first entry from the contents of the extension document such that the textual description of the data field is output in the first language (" the requested document is automatically served in the visitor's language"; Abstract, lines 6 – 8; page 44, lines 25, and 26).

As per claim 2, Lakritz further discloses that the extension document is received from a back-end analytical system ("visitor module greatly enhances the multilingual web site visitor's experience"; page 5, lines 17 – 26).

As per claim 3, Lakritz further discloses storing contents of the extension document in a database, the contents including the first and second entries ("content from the database"; Abstract, lines 7, and 8).

As per claims 4, and 12, Lakritz further discloses determining from a login by the front-end application that the textual information should be output in the first language ("determine the country if it is not known on an initial request, and determine the language of the requester"; page 42, lines 5 –15; Abstract, lines 6 - 8).

As per claims 9, and 16, Lakritz further discloses that the first language is English and the second language is German (page 82, lines 11 – 20; page 40, lines 1 – 5).

As per claim 15, Lakritz further discloses substituting the first entry of the extension document for the unique identifier such that the textual description of the data field is output in the first language (“enabling it to be replaced with its translation in the most recently valid language of the visitor”; col.8, lines 30 – 34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5 – 8, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz (WO 01/69420) in view of Russakovsky et al., (US Patent 7,024,417).

As per claims 5, and 13, Lakritz does not specifically teach that the request from the front-end application is a request for execution of a prediction task.

Russakovsky et al., teach task for exporting mining models to and importing mining models from predictive model markup language (col.7, lines 26 – 31).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use predictive model markup language as taught by

Art Unit: 2626

Russakovsky et al., in Lakritz because that would efficiently produce new previously unknown information (col.1, lines 24 – 26).

As per claim 6, Russakovsky et al., further disclose invoking execution of the prediction task by a prediction engine using the data mining model (col.7, lines 26 – 31).

As per claim 7, Russakovsky et al., further disclose that the data mining model and the extension document are PMML-compliant (col.7, lines 26 – 31).

As per claim 8, Russakovsky et al., further disclose that the data mining model includes a data field indicative of a predicted result of a particular transaction between the front-end application and a customer ("mining objects such as models and results sets are usually stored in at the site of the original data source"; col.7, lines 16 – 18, and 26 – 28).

As per claims 11, and 14, Lakritz does not specifically teach that the data mining model and the extension document are PMML-compliant; invoking execution of the prediction task by a prediction engine using the data mining model.

Russakovsky et al., teach task for exporting mining models to and importing mining models from predictive model markup language (col.7, lines 26 – 31).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use predictive model markup language as taught by

Art Unit: 2626

Russakovsky et al., in Lakritz because that would efficiently produce new previously unknown information (col.1, lines 24 – 26).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tamayo et al., (US Patent 6,941,318) teach universal tree interpreter for data mining models.

Lee et al., (US Patent 6,782,390) teach execution of multiple models using data segmentation.

Huyn et al., (US Patent 2002/0035486) teach a computerized clinical questionnaire with dynamically presented questions.

Tang et al., (US Patent 6,931,391) teach systems and methods for generating prediction queries.

Hornick et al., (US Patent 6,865,573) teach data mining application programming interface.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonard Saint-Cyr whose telephone number is (571) 272-4247. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 2727602. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2626

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LS
03/27/07



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER